UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,887	04/05/2004	Do-heon Kim	Q79993	2675

23373 7590 09/29/2008

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
LINDSEY, MATTHEW S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 13-19 and 22-26 have been finally rejected, for the reasons stated below the rejection is maintained.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 9 September 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues: "Sherman does not teach or suggest 'setting a security level'" (pg 4, lines 5-6). Examiner respectfully disagrees, Sherman disclosed: "each port of the workstation 12 has a defined security level as specified by a TCB" (Col. 4, lines 60-62). Furthermore, applicant notes "Sherman also teaches that each port of a workstation has a defined security level which is specified by the TCB" (pg 4, lines 2-3). Specifying a security level is equivalent to "setting a security level".

4. Applicant further argues: "Sherman only sets the security level of its corresponding port" (pg 4, lines 20-21) and "the join module, which belongs to the second network, sets a security level of the first network to a set security level" (pg 4, lines 18-19) is not disclosed by Sherman. Examiner respectfully disagrees: "the join module, which belongs to the second network, sets a security level of the first network to a set security level (Sherman, Col. 4, lines 33-41 and 60-62, each port having a defined security level. Communications through the port are at the defined security

level as well because the system of Sherman does not allow communication between TCBs at different security levels, see Col. 4, lines 40-41. Thus, when the port at a defined security level is communicating with other networks, the other networks are also at the same security level, set by the join module, or TCB, because TCBs of different security levels cannot communicate. By specifying a security level of the port, the TCB sets the security level of the networks that the port can communicate with)".

5. Applicant argues: "Comparing the structure taught by Sherman to the claim language, the TCB of a second network that receives an inter-network connection request from a first network does not set the security level of the first network that sent the inter-network connection request message" (pg 5, lines 8-10). Examiner respectfully disagrees; Sherman disclosed defining the security level of a port, and preventing communication between TCBs at different security levels (Sherman, Col. 4, lines 33-41 and 60-62). Therefore when a port is communicating with a first network, the first network must have the same security level as the port. When the TCB specifies the security level, it further specifies the security level of the networks it can communicate with because the port and network must be at the same security level.

6. Applicant further argues the dependent nature of Claims 3-5 and 8 on independent Claim 1 make these claims allowable over the prior art (pg 6, lines 2-3). Examiner respectfully disagrees, see arguments in response to Claim 1 above.

7. Applicant argues Claim 9 recites similar limitations to those discussed in conjunction with Claim 1 and is patentable for similar reasons. Applicant also argues claims 10 and 13-16 are patentable because of their dependent nature on Claim 9 (pg 6, lines 5-8). Examiner respectfully disagrees, see arguments in response to Claim 1 above.

8. Applicant argues Claim 18 recites similar limitations to those discussed in conjunction with Claim 1 and is patentable for similar reasons. Applicant also argues claims 19 and 22-25 are patentable because of their dependent nature on Claim 18 (pg 6, lines 10-13). Examiner respectfully disagrees, see arguments in response to Claim 1 above.

9. Applicant further argues the dependent nature of Claims 6, 17 and 26 on independent Claims 1, 9 and 18 make these claims allowable over the prior art (pg 6, lines 18-21). Examiner respectfully disagrees, see arguments in response to Claim 1 above.

All arguments have been addressed; therefore all rejections are hereby maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. LINDSEY whose telephone number is

(571)270-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7-5, Fridays 7-12.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSL
9/24/2008

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151